| **Student Name:** Theodore Wang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will enforce filial responsibility laws |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  Good focal point in the hook on the injustice children suffer from when they did not choose to be born.   * Nice signposting. Preview the argument as well in the signposting.   On children being adopted, we cannot just attack the failure of parents, Prop has also proposed caveats to exempt children who have been mistreated or abandoned by parents.   * So this would be outside of the debate.   Good observation on the limitations of the model and it doesn’t improve the relationships of parent and child.   * However, on a scale, Proposition will still garner more funding to care for the parents. They did not claim that their model will improve familial bonds.   + So we need to focus on a policy-to-policy comparison of who better cares for parents. There has been no clear defence of your countermodel at this point. Actively explain to me why it’s a good enough alternative to deal with the rising ageing population, otherwise Prop will win on the biggest issue of human costs.   I appreciate the reinforcement that there is a lack of consent on the child’s part.   * While I understand the broad claim that parents should bear the full consequences of their own action, we’re not stating HOW this analysis takes down the claim of reciprocity.   Good observation that their criticisms of elderly homes will also apply to Proposition, since their model is limited to just financial obligations!   * Take it further and explain why you can improve the flaws of elderly homes in Opp’s countermodel.   On children who willingly take care of their parents if they were raised well, there is no clear pathway for Opposition to IMPROVE this in a preventative manner. So what happens to parents who have already made the mistake of not fostering their bond with their child?   * Try to conclude this in a more strategic fashion, which means the majority of parents will be cared for even without this policy. And Prop’s main stakeholder is exclusively parents who have actively harmed their parents, and it’s unfair for children who will be forced to take care of the parents here.   While I understand the value of the argument on making the relationship transactional, the narrative harm is under-analysed.   * How are we mechanising the impact of this argument? How do people alter their relationships simply due to messaging of this policy? * I get the impact, I don’t know how the impact manifests. So make the analytical focus centered on the warrants instead.   Nice job offering POIs today!  7.15 - Nice job. | | | | | | |